

REMARKS

In an office action dated 10 September 2003, the Examiner rejects claims 19-34 (all pending claims). In response to the rejections, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Claims 19-34 remain in the application. In light of the argument set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims be allowed.

The Examiner rejects claims 19 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶ 1 as failing to comply with the written description. Applicants amended the storing element in both claims after a telephone conference with the Examiner on 29 July 2003. At the time, the Applicants and the Examiner agreed that the language agreed upon made the claims more understandable. No matter was added by these amendments. Thus, Applicants do not understand the Examiners rationale for this rejection. The storing element is supported by step 140 and the description at page 21 lines 11-16. The cited passage states the database indicates the subsystem to notify at the requested tuple. Although not using the express language of storing, as stated in the claim, this is clearly what is meant by the passage. The applicants used the more precise term of storing to make the claim more understandable. The Applicants can see no reason why the mere substitution of words would take the amendment outside of the disclosed specification. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶ 1 be removed.

The Examiner also rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,115,715 issued to Traversat (Traversat). In order to maintain a rejection the Examiner has the burden of providing evidence of prima facie obviousness. See MPEP §2143. See also In Re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In order to prove prima facie obviousness, the Examiner must provide evidence in the prior art of a motivation to combine or modify a reference, a reasonable expectation of success, and a teaching of each and every claimed element. Id.

Claim 17 recites "storing an identification of said one of said plurality of subsystems that transmitted said notification request in a record in said database that stores said configuration data for said object identified in said notification request wherein said identification identifies said one of said plurality of subsystems as a subsystem to notify in response to a change in said configuration data for said object in said record." The Examiner contradicts himself in the rejection stating that Traversat does not teach this limitation at page 5, line 9. The Examiner then provides cited passages from page 5, line 10- page 6, line 10. The Examiner then states that the described technique performs the storing step at page 6 lines 10-16 of the office action. Therefore, applicant is not sure as to whether the Examiner is asserting the storing limitation is taught or that Traversat may be modified to perform the function. Applicants therefore request clarification of this point or the rejection cannot be maintained. If the Examiner clarifies this point Applicants feel Applicants should be given an opportunity to respond to such clarification and another non-final office action should be issued. Otherwise, the Examiner must remove the rejection and allow claim 17.

Applicant is responding under the assumption that the Examiner is stating that the storing limitation of claim 17 is taught by Traversat. If the Examiner is modifying the teaching of Traversat the following argument does not apply.

Traversat does not teach the storing element recited in claim 17. Instead, Traversat teaches a method for managing transactions and updating a configuration database. See Col. 2, lines 18-32. An event manager monitors the transactions and is notified when a transaction changes the configuration database is completed or aborted. See Col. 2 lines 33-47. Traversat also teaches an event notification manager that alerts transactions of locks and releases in order for the transactions to in turn place a lock on the configuration database and complete the transaction. See Col. 2, lines 48-61.

In particular, Traversat does not teach storing an identification in the record (or entry) of a subsystem to notify when a change is made to the information. The section in Traversat that the Examiner has cited as teaching this limitation does not store the identification in the record or entry for the information. See Generally Col. 8, line 42- Col. 10, line 54. Instead, this section teaches using a separate table to maintain a list of transactions that must be notified when a lock on the database is released. Furthermore transactions are processes to be performed on the database and the claim clearly recites that the identification identifies a subsystem of the router system that is to be notified when a change in data occurs. Claim 19 is claiming a system that allows a quick and simple manner for a database system to store the identifications of subsystems to be notified when configuration data in an entry is changed. The cited section in Traversat and Traversat in general are teaching an object that uses its own storage or table to complete transactions that modify the data in a configuration database. There is no teaching in Traversat that teaches storing the identity of a subsystem in a record. Therefore, Traversat does not teach the storing element of claim 19 and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be removed.

The Examiner also states that Traversat teaches that the system database can operate on other platforms. Applicants cannot find this teaching in Traversat. Thus, there is no motivation to modify Traversat to perform on a router system. Thus, the rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that claim 17 be allowed.

Claims 20-26 are dependent from claim 19. Thus, claims 20-26 are allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Thus applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 20-26 be removed and claims 20-26 be allowed.

Claim 27 recited a method performed by the product of claim 19. Thus, claim 27 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 19. Therefore, the rejection of claim 27 must be removed. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request claim 27 be allowed.


Claims 28-34 are dependent from claim 27. Thus, claims 28-34 are allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 27. Thus applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 28-34 be removed and claims 28-34 be allowed.

The Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500 to discuss any questions regarding this response or the application in general.

Dated: 21 Oct 2003

Sierra Patent group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 586-9500

Respectfully submitted,
Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.



William P. Wilbar
Reg. No. 43,265